

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are cancelled, claims 8-11 remain in this application as amended herein, and claims 12-14 are added. Accordingly, claims 8-14 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 11 has been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0145584). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Lee.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 3 and 6 and pages 21-22 and 35-36 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 8 recites:

a second power conversion section including a primary side for receiving said direct current input voltage, a secondary side isolated from said primary side for generating a power-supply voltage to be supplied to said backlight section, a detection circuit for detecting one of the power-supply voltage supplied to said backlight section or a current supplied to said backlight section, a feedback section for receiving a detection signal generated by said detection section and for feeding back the detection signal to said primary side of said second power conversion section[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Lee neither disclose nor suggest a feedback section for receiving a detection signal generated by said detection section and for

feeding back a detection signal to a primary side of a second power conversion section.

Rather, Lee merely show a current detecting section for detecting current levels in a load (see Fig. 5 and ¶ [0072]) and for detecting current levels in a fluorescent lamp and providing a current detecting signal to a first voltage converting section (see Fig. 6 and ¶ [0080]). The relied on sections of Lee are not at all concerned with feeding back a detection signal to a primary side of a second voltage converting section and hence neither disclose nor suggest the features set out in the above excerpt of claim 8.

It follows, for at least these reasons, that the relied on sections of Lee do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 8 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Lee for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

New claims 12-14 depend from claim 8, and therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons. New claims 12-14 recite features similar to those set out in cancelled claims 2-4 and therefore are similarly supported.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Lawrence
E. Russ/

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

963051_1.DOC